Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-083001 / Communications 14



THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Zhaoxi Bu et al.

Art Unit :

2142

Serial No.: 09/842,025

Examiner:

Hai V. Nguyen

Filed

: April 26, 2001

Confirmation No.:

6907

Title

: AUTOMATIC USER SESSION

Mail Stop Amendment

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY TO ACTION OF AUGUST 9, 2005

In response to the non-final office action of August 9, 2005, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-41 are now pending, of which claims 1, 22 and 27 are independent.

Rejection of Claims 1-41 under Section 103

Claims 1-41¹ have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over MacNaughton (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,393) in view of Kumar (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,993). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-41 because neither MacNaughton, Kumar, nor any combination of the references describes or suggests the subject matter of independent claims 1, 22, and 27.

Claim 1 recites a method of retrieving electronic data from a communications system. The method includes, *inter alia*, establishing a connection between a client system and a host system using a first account of a user. The method also includes initiating a first communication session over the connection associated with the first account of the user maintained by the host system; and automatically initiating, over the same connection to the host system, one or more additional communication sessions associated with one or more additional accounts of the user maintained by the host system.

The Office action concedes that MacNaughton does not explicitly show automatically initiating, over the same connection to the host system, one or more additional communication

As an administrative matter, the Office action indicates that claims 28-41 are new. See Office action at page 2, line 3. However, claims 28-41 were added in reply to the Office action of September 21, 2004 (filed on January 19, 2005) and were examined in the previous Office action of May 16, 2005.